

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated November 26, 2004. Claims 1-12 were pending in the application. In the Office Action, claims 1-12 were rejected. In this Amendment, claims 2, 6, 11 and 12 have been canceled, claims 1, 3, 4, 9 and 10 have been amended, and new claims 13-15 have been added. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-10 and 13-15 thus remain for consideration.

Applicants submit that claims 1, 3-5, 7-10 and 13-15 are in condition for allowance and request withdrawal of the rejections in light of the following remarks.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner asserted that the information disclosure statement (IDS) filed on November 29, 2002 failed to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.98(a)(2) because Applicants did not provide copies of all the listed references.

Applicants submit that they did provide copies of all the listed references with the November 29, 2002 Information Disclosure Statement.

Enclosed herewith is a copy of the November 29, 2002 Information Disclosure Statement and a copy of the returned postcard bearing the PTO stamp acknowledging receipt of the Information Disclosure Statement. Also enclosed, for the Examiner's convenience, are copies of the references listed in the Information Disclosure Statement.

Since Applicants provided the appropriate references at the time of filing the Information Disclosure Statement, Applicants submit that the Information Disclosure Statement was compliant with 37 C.F.R. §1.98(a)(2) and that no fee is now due for re-submission of the references.

Nevertheless, if the Examiner maintains that the November 29, 2002 Information Disclosure Statement was non-compliant, the Examiner is authorized to charge the appropriate fee for re-submission to Deposit Account No. 12-1095.

#### §102 Rejections

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Shiels et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,848,934)

Claims 2, 6, 11 and 12 have been canceled, thereby rendering their rejections moot.

Applicants submit that the independent claims (claims 1, 9 and 10) are patentable over *Shiels*.

Applicants' invention as recited in the independent claims is directed toward a stream data reproducing device, a stream data reproducing method and a recording medium storing a stream data reproducing program. Each of the claims recites that the stream data is stored "in a first continuous sequence" and reproduced "in a second sequence different from the first continuous sequence." The second sequence is reproduced by applying "branch information" to the first continuous sequence, the branch information including a "branch position" in the first continuous sequence and "a branch destination" in the first continuous sequence. More specifically, the stream data is read out by reading "up to [the] branch position in the stream data, and thereafter branching the reading and reading the stream data from [the] branch destination."

*Shiels* does not disclose generating a reproduced sequence by branching within a first continuous sequence. Rather, *Shiels* generates an output sequence by piecing together individual "paths" or "segments." That is, *Shiels* can not merely call up one continuous sequence and branch within that sequence. It must branch from one continuous sequence to another. Indeed, *Shiels* states that "A principal requirement for seamless joining

is that the system has sufficient time to call up the selected next video segment and synchronize its start to the end of the present sequence." (*Shiels* col. 5, line 66 - col. 6, line 2).

Since *Shiels* does not disclose generating a reproduced sequence by branching within a first continuous sequence, Applicants believe that claims 1, 9 and 10 are patentable over *Shiels* on at least this basis.

Moreover, since dependent claims inherit the limitations of their respective base claims, Applicants submit that dependent claims 3-5, 7 and 8 are patentable over *Shiels* for at least the same reasons discussed in connection with independent claims 1, 9 and 10.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited references represent the present opinions of the Applicants' undersigned attorney and, in the event that the Examiner disagrees with any such opinions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the respective reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions, he/she is invited to call (908) 654-5000.

The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account No. 12-1095.

Application No.: 09/814,568

Docket No.: SCEI 3.0-059

The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Dated: February 22, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Bruno Polito

Registration No.: 38,580

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicants

542332\_1.DOC